

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/973,303	10/09/2001	Nobuo Ogasawara	47410/JEC/F179	8147	
23363	7590 10/16/2002				
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			EXAMINER		
SUITE 500	OLORADO BOULEVARE	)	RICE, KENNETH R		
PASADENA, CA 91105			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3627		
			DATE MAILED: 10/16/2002	DATE MAILED: 10/16/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/973,303 Applicant(s)

Ogasawara Group Art Unit

Examiner

Kenneth R. Rice

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address-

Period for Response	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE 3 MONTHS FROM
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no even the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within If NO period of response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6 Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause</li> </ul>	the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. ) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
Status	
<ul> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on</li> <li>This action is FINAL.</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for forma accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11;</li> </ul>	
Disposition of Claims	
<ul> <li>□ Claim(s) _1, 3-9 &amp; 34-38 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>□ Of the above, claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>□ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction or election requirement.</li> </ul>	
Application Papers	
<ul> <li>□ See the attached Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PT</li> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is □ approved □</li> <li>□ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</li> </ul>	
Status of Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	
<ul> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the prioring received.</li> <li>□ received in Application No</li> <li>□ received in this national stage application from the Internation *Certified copies not received:</li> </ul>	ity documents have been
Attachment(s)	
<ul> <li>☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449</li> <li>☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892</li> <li>☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Interview Summary, PTO-413</li> <li>□ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152</li> <li>□ Other</li> </ul>
Office Action Sum	nmary

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 3-97)

Part of Paper No. 9

## PART III: REASONS FOR REJECTIONS AND OBJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 USC 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1, 3-9 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Colella et al.

The following is a quotation of 35 USC 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made. Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1, 3-9 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Singer et al. Singer et al discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Singer et al does not disclose providing the purchaser access to the microprocessor for managing use of the products with shelf life limitations. Singer et al describes providing access by users to the microprocessor by means of a password control security system (column 13, lines 28-40). The choice of who constitutes a user is clearly an administrative decision and can obviously include the purchaser of the products being stored in the system of Singer et al. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide purchaser access to the microprocessor in the system of Singer et al in order to allow the purchasers to managed the expiration dated product they have stored in the system of Singer et al.

Applicant's arguments filed August 20, 2002, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant argues that neither Singer et al nor Colella et al discloses the product shelf-life limitation being provided to a microprocessor accessible by the purchaser of the product for managing the product. In regard to Singer et al, this has been discussed in the above rejection. Colella et al does show this claim limitation. In Colella et al, the purchaser of the drugs is the medical staff which uses the computer system to manage the drugs. It is the medical staff that orders the drugs, manages the use of the drugs, and has access to the microprocessor with the shelf-life

limitations of the drugs. The patient is the beneficiary of the drugs, but is not involved in the purchase and management of the drugs. Considering the health benefit plans available today, the patient might not even pay for the drugs.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Rice at (703) 308-3495. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 308-1113.

Kenneth R. Rice Primary Examiner Art Unit 3627